A 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A g = gnppi = 2 alpha (% slc) = INDIVX	AVG(S42S48) 65.71% 0.00%	S -2.80688266]2.67211322 -2.63703958 -2.71890020 -2.74161328 -2.78584210 -2.76115241 -2.79317982	T 7 19 32 50 63.5 74 86	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	8 PERIOD TOTAL SW RATE/M REGRESSION	W 19.02828287 19.11356205 OU 19.10820345 19.31459223 19.44856070 19.53857247 19.60447847 19.67145657
11	Compromise X =	2.96%	Re	gression Output			
12	Compromise X =	2.0070	Constant	gression output	•		0 Constant
13			Std Err of Y Est			0.05	97 Std Err of Y Est
14	C	L PCI	R Squared				24 R Squared
15		-	No. of Observati	ions		0	8 No. of Observat
16	Per Line	98.07%	Degrees of Free				6 Degrees of Fre
17			J				•
18			X Coefficient(s)		-0.0007	-2.69	94 X Coefficient(s)
19	UNITARYX		Std Err of Coef.		0.0007	0.04	28 Std Err of Coef.
20							
21							
22	Per Line X =	1.64%			0.0669		
23	Compromise X =	2.67%			0.0625		
24					-0.90%		
25							
26 27							
28	Compromise						
29	Compromise						
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							data
38				GNP-PI***	GNP-PI***	analysis	source
39				ART QUARTER	END QUARTER	period	period
40		•	gnp-pi	240.7	007.7	4 - CIOA EIGE	0014 0014
41		1	4.12% (U42/T42)-1	218.7 227.6		1 = 6/84 - 5/85 2 = 6/85 - 5/86	82/4 83/4 83/4 84/4
42			(U43/T43)-1	110		2 = 6/65 - 5/66 3 = 7/86 - 6/87	84/4 85/4
43 44			(U44/T44)-1	114.7		4 = 1988	86/2 87/2
44 45			(U45/T45)-1	119.7		5 = 4/89 -12/89	87/3 88/3
45 46			(U46/T46)-1	123.3		6 = 1990	88/2 89/2
47			(U47/T47)-1	131.2		7 = 1991	89/4 90/4
48			(U48/T48)-1	114.8		8 = 1992	90/4 91/4
		ļ	Zii _:.71 · 1			•	

1		

25 A	G	H g factor
∠6		
27		(A)
28		
29	Ameritech	7.79%
30	Bell Atlantic	6.03%
31	Bell South	5.56%
32	Nynex	5.94%
33	Pac Tel	8.64%
34	Southwestern	6.59%
35	US West	7.43%
36	Centel	5.40%
37	Cincinnati	6.04%
38	Contel	7.49%
39	GTE	6.64%
40	Lincoln	6.94%
41	Rochester	6.61%
42	SNETCO	4.78%
43	United	9.10%
44		
45	TOT	6.69%

2.5 A	G	H g factor
∠6 27		(A)
28		(^)
29	Ameritech	7.79%
30	Bell Atlantic	6.03%
31	Bell South	5.56%
32	Nynex	5.94%
33	Pac Tel	8.64%
34	Southwestern	6.59%
35	US West	7.43%
36	Centel	5.40%
37	Cincinnati	6.04%
38	Contel	7.49%
39	GTE	6.64%
40	Lincoln	6.94%
41	Rochester	6.61%
42	SNETCO	4.78%
43	United	9.10%
44		
45	TOT	(1+0.1)/(1+0.031)-1

Α	Α _	B
1	g =	4.75%
2	gbar =	2.60%
3	gnppi =	3.90%
4	Per Line X =	2.97%
5	50/50 X =	4.17%
6	alpha =	61.38%
7	Compromise X =	3.43%

Α	Α	B
1		08/1.031-1
2	gbar =	2.60%
3	gnppi =	3.90%
4	Per Line X =	2.97%
5	50/50 X =	4.17%
6	alpha =	61.38%
7	Compromise X =	3.43%

1 A	^ 9 - F	R 6.19%	C based on una	D dj. CL minutes	V	W 19.02828287	X 7	Y 1	Z	AA 18.51567708	AB 7	AC 1	AD
2	gnppi =	4.06%			8 PERIOD	19.11356205	19	1	8 PERIOD	18.54569309	19	1	8 PERIOD
3	alpha (% sic) =	65.71%	based on una	dj. rev.	TOTAL SW RATE/MOU		32	1	CL MOU	18.56964941	32	1	LINES
4					REGRESSION	19.31459223	50	1	REGRESSION	18.61669458	50	1	REGRESSION
5		0.00%			-44	19.44856070	63.5	1 -		18.64858065	63.5	1 -	
6	INDIVX	4.28%				19.53857247	74	1		18.69192902	74	1	
7		٥.	70			19.60447847	86	1		18.71591324	86	!	
8		CL	TS			19.67145657	98	1		18.74011062	98	1	
10 11	Per Line X =	-0.08% 2.96%	3.44% 3.44%		4 Xs based on fitted value = M32,M39,Q32)		s egression Output:			Re	gression Output	:	
12	Compromiso X =	2.0070	0.4470	(10111111111111111111111111111111111111		Constant	- g		0	Constant	g. ccc.c ca.pa.	•	0
13			% change	% change	0.0597	Std Err of Y Est			0.04034938	Std Err of Y Est			0.00633965
14	C	L PCI	CCL	TS	0.1624	R Squared			0.97740857	R Squared			0.99494241
15					_	No. of Observation				No. of Observations			8
16	Per Line	98.07%	5.55%	0.63%	6	Degrees of Freedo	m		6	Degrees of Freedor	m		6
17					0.0004	V C#::::-::4:	,	007505600	40 0477007000	V Confficient(s)		0.00053470643	40 4044450804
18						X Coefficient(s) Std Err of Coef.		0.007565688	0.02896676658	X Coefficient(s)		0.00253476643	18.4944456 894 0.004551225 8 3
19	UNITARYX				0.0428	SIG EN OF COR.	L_ '	1.000408577	0.02690070036	SIG EII OI COM.	L	0.00007377936	0.00433122363
20 21	-1.00												
22	Per Line X =	1 64%	weighted aw	erage of individu	ual per line Xs		1	78525235.6				109582588.346	
23	Compromise X =	2.67%			ed on total % change from	individual Xs		55387096.6				138012221.28	
24	Compromise X	2.57 76	(formula cel					9.47%				3.08%	

A 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A g = gnppi = alpha (% slc) =	4.06%	C based on una based on una TS	D dj. CL minutes dj. rev.	V 8 PERIOD TOTAL SW RATE/MOU REGRESSION	W 19.02828287 19.11356205 19.10820345 19.31459223 19.44856070 19.53857247 19.60447847 19.67145657	X 7 19 32 50 63.5 74 86 98	Y 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Z 8 PERIOD CL MOU REGRESSION	AA 18.51567708 18.54569309 18.56964941 18.61669458 18.64858065 18.69192902 18.71591324 18.74011062	AB 7 19 32 50 63 5 74 86 98	AC 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	AD 8 PERIOD LINES REGRESSION
9 10 11 12 13 14	Per Line X = Compromise X =	-0.08% 2.96%	3.44% 3.44% % change CCL		0.0597 5 0.1624 f		Regression Outpu	ıt:	0.04034938 0.97740857	Constant Std Err of Y Est	egression Output:		0 0.00633965 0.99494241 8
16 17 18 19	Per Line UNITARYX	98.07%	5.55%	0.63%	-2.6994)	Degrees of Freed X Coefficient(s) Std Err of Coef.		0.0075656884 0.0004695768	6 18.9472807068	Degrees of Freedo X Coefficient(s) Std Err of Coef.	om [0.00253476643 0.00007377938	6 18.4944456894 0.00455122583
21 22 23 24	Per Line X = Compromise X =	1.64% 2.67%			al per line Xs d on total % change from i	individual Xs	Œ	178525235.64 355387096.62 Y18+1)^(12)-1				109582588.346 138012221.28 \C18+1)^(12)-1	

•

19 20 dZ [3.64%
22	
23 Common Line PCI	Percent Change i
24 Common Line SLC	
25 Revenue Revenue g factor % SLC Per Line 50/50 Formula API Formula USTA Formula 2nd 50/50 Formula	Per Line
26	(H)
28	(11)
29 \$803,888 \$522,732 Ameritech 7.79% 65.03% 94.24% 94.74% 100.15% 103.90% 100.15	% -3.03%
30 \$988,820 \$619,351 Bell Atlantic 6.03% 62.64% 95.81% 95.50% 100.95% 103.90% 100.95	% -1.70%
31 \$1,483,274 \$843,958 Bell South 5.58% 56.90% 96.23% 95.70% 101.16% 103.90% 101.16	% -1.80%
32 \$1,186,948 \$744,876 Nynex 5.94% 62.76% 95.89% 95.54% 100.99% 103.90% 100.99	% -1.60%
33 \$843,377 \$597,438 Pac Tel 8.64% 70.84% 93.50% 94.38% 99.77% 103.90% 99.77	% -2.97%
34 \$838,123 \$538,948 Southwestern 6.59% 64.30% 95.30% 95.25% 100.69% 103.90% 100.69	% -2.03%
35 \$988,682 \$630,784 US West 7.43% 63.80% 94.55% 94.89% 100.31% 103.90% 100.31	% -2.85%
36 \$46,494 \$18,384 Centel 5.40% 39.54% 96.38% 95.77% 101.24% 103.90% 101.24	% -2.64%
37 \$51,043 \$33,261 Cincinnati 6.04% 65.06% 95.80% 95.49% 100.94% 103.90% 100.94	
38 \$95,569 \$48,660 Contel 7.49% 50.91% 94.50% 94.87% 100.28% 103.90% 100.28	% -3.97%
39 \$1,080,841 \$607,724 GTE 6.64% 56.23% 95.25% 95.23% 100.66% 103.90% 100.66	
40 \$11,300 \$7,106 Lincoln 6.94% 62.88% 94.98% 95.10% 100.53% 103.90% 100.53	
41 \$21,563 \$13,719 Rochester 6.61% 63.62% 95.28% 95.24% 100.68% 103.90% 100.68	
42 \$144,710 \$85,714 SNETCO 4.78% 59.23% 96.95% 96.05% 101.53% 103.90% 101.53	
43 \$268,658 \$161,332 United 9.10% 60.05% 93.11% 94.19% 99.57% 103.90% 99.57	% -4.71%
44	0.000
45 \$8,853,290 \$5,473,989 TOT 6.69% 61.83% 95.21% 95.21% 100.64% 103.90% 100.64	%
46	
47 48 Traffic Sensitive Rate Change	Switched Access
49	Switched Access
50 Per Line 50/50 Formula	Per Line
51	r er cine
52 (C) (D)	(H)
53	
54 TOT 0.26% 0.26%	-0.35%

A 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	С	D 	EF G	Н	ı	J	σZ	K GNP-P∮ Per Line X 50/50 X		M Per Line PCI ark 50/50 PCI and R	ROR CCL	IS X FACTOR O	0 0364] 3 64%
21 22 23 24	Common Line	I I SLC I				Common Line PCI						Percent Change in CCL Rate	
25 26	Revenue	Revenue		g factor	% SLC	Per Line	-	50/50 Formula	API Formula	USTA Formula	2nd 50/50 Formula	Per Line	
27	(3)	(4)		(A)	(B)	(C)		(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	\$803,888 \$988,820 \$1,483,274 \$1,186,948 \$843,377 \$896,123 \$986,682 \$46,494 \$51,060,841 \$11,360 \$21,563 \$1,44,710 \$268,658	\$522,732 \$619,351 \$843,958 \$744,876 \$597,438 \$539,484 \$630,784 \$18,384 \$33,261 \$48,660 \$607,724 \$7,106 \$13,719 \$85,714 \$161,332	Ameritech Bell South Nynex Pac Tel Southvestem US West Centel Cincinnati Contel GTE Lincoln Rochester SNETCO United	7 43% 5 40% 6 .04% 7 49% 6 64% 6 .61% 4 78% 9 10%	65.03% 62.84% 56.90% 62.76% 70.84% 64.30% 63.80% 39.54% 65.08% 50.91% 56.23% 62.88% 63.62% 59.23% 60.05%		94.24% 95.81% 96.23% 95.89% 93.50% 95.30% 94.55% 96.38% 95.25% 94.50% 95.25% 94.96% 95.26% 96.95%	94.74% 95.50% 95.70% 95.54% 94.38% 95.25% 94.89% 95.77% 95.43% 95.23% 95.23% 95.24% 96.05%	100.15% 100.95% 101.16% 100.99% 99.77% 100.69% 100.31% 101.24% 100.94% 100.26% 100.66% 100.53% 99.57%	103 90% 103 90%	100.15% 100.95% 101.16% 100.99% 99.77% 100.68% 100.28% 100.28% 100.66% 100.53% 100.66%		3 03% -1 70% -1 80% -2 97% -2 03% -2 85% -2 84% -1 41% -3 97% -2 84% -2 13% -0 86% -4 71%
45 46 47	OSUM(CAS. COM)	SUM(D43D29)	тот	(1+0.1)/(1+0.031)-1	61.83% ([1+(((C	45+\$DZ)/C45)*((\$GNPPI-\$XPL-H4	5 <u>V(1+H45)))</u>	95.21%	100.64%	103.90%	100.64%[(C45*(J45-1)+D45*(H45/(1+H45)))/(C45-D45)
48 49					******	Traffic Sensitive Rate Change		·				Switched Access Rate Change	
50 51						Per Line		50/50 Formula				Per Line	
52 53						(C)		(D)				(H)	
54			тот		+GNPI	P-015		0.26%			E	37/2/(U.S. 370037) O 570037/(U.S.	+6037)*354

Α	Α	<u>B</u>	С	D E	F	G
1	g =	4.75%	Method 1	0.36%	Percent change	
2	gbar =	2.60%	Method 2	0.28%	in CCL rate	
3	gnppi =	3.90%	Method 3	0.23%	for 1% increase	
4	Per Line X =	2.97%	Method 4	-0.48%	in g	
5	50/50 X =	4.17%		į	•	
6	alpha =	61.38%	50/50	0.27%		
7	Compromise X =	3.43%	Per Line	-0.93% i		
8				•		
9				% change	% change	% change
10				CCL	TS	TotSw
11	3372	21.699768	Method 1	0.56%	0.93%	0.82%
12	8037	-22.02138	Method 2	0.43%	0.93%	0.79%
13	2555	-7.0007	Method 3	0.36%	0.93%	0.76%
14		-7.322312	Method 4	-1.21%	0.93%	0.30%
15						2,22,2
16	(\$59.9)	-38.18578	50/50	0.64%	-0.27%	-0.00%
17	\$59.8	37.7739	Per Line	-2.23%	0.93%	-0.00%
18	\$19.0	12.0085	Compromise	-1.13%	0.47%	-0.00%

1 A	A g ={	B 1.08/1.031-1	C Method 1	D 0.36%	E F Percent change	G
2	gbar =	2.60%	Method 2	0.28%	in CCL rate	
3	gnppi =	0.039	Method 3	0.23%	for 1% increase	
4	Per Line X =	2.97%	Method 4	-0.48% (in g	
5	50/50 X =	4.17%		Ť	_	
6	alpha =	0.6138	50/50	0.27%		
7	Compromise X = [0.0343	Per Line	-0.93%		
8				·		
9				% change	% change	% change
10				CCL	TS	TotSw
11	3372	21.69976782	Method 1	0.56%	0.93%	0.82%
12	8037	-22.02138	Method 2	0.43%	0.93%	0.79%
13	2555	-7.0007	Method 3	0.36%	0.93%	0.76%
14		-7.32231218	Method 4	-1.21%	0.93%	0.30%
15						
16	(\$59.9)	-38.1857808	50/50	0.64%	-0.27%	-0.00%
17	\$59.8	37.7739	Per Line	-2.23%	0.93%	-0.00%
18	\$19.0	12.0085	Compromise((SNPPI-XCOMP-((G/2)*(1-ALPHA)))/((1+(G/2))*(1-ALPHA))	+GNPPI-XCOMP	((3372/(3372+8037))*D18)+((8037/(3372+8037))*F18)

CLEC							C,	nt Weights							Value \
A g = gnppi = alpha (% skc) =	4.06%	C based on una based on una		E ALT G retn ALT Z perfo	P 7 19 32 50 63 5 74 86 98	Q 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	R 8 PERIOD TS RATE/MOU REGRESSION	19.31459223	X 7 19 32 50 63.5 74 86 98	Y 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Z 8 PERIOD CL MOU REGRESSION	AA 18.51567708 18.54569309 18.56964941 18.6169458 18.64858065 18.69192902 18.71591324 18.74011062	AB 7 19 32 50 63.5 74 86 98	AC 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	AD 8 PERIOD LINES REGRESSION
Per Line X = Compromise X =	-0.08% 2.96%	3.44% 3.44% % change	(formula cells % change	= M32,M39, Re % change	fitted values fr		0.0763	Reg Constant Std Err of Y Est	gression Output:	·	0.04034938	Re Constant Std Err of Y Est	egression Outpu	it.	0 0 00633965
Per Line	98.07%	CCL 5.55%	TS 0.63%	TotSw 1.28%			8	R Squared No. of Observations Degrees of Freedon				R Squared No. of Observation Degrees of Freedo			0. 994 94241 8 6
UNITARYX	_					0.0005 0.0009		X Coefficient(s) Std Err of Coef.		07565688 00469577	18.9472807068 0.02896676658	X Coefficient(s) Std Err of Coef.		0.00253476643 0.00007377938	18.4944456894 0.00455122583
Per Line X = Compromise X =		back-solve formula cel		d on total % ch	ange from ind	0.024367175 0.025454421 0.58%				525235.6 387096.6 9.47%	l			109582588.346 138012221.28 3.08%	l
Compromise	ı	% change CCL 0.95%	% change TS 1.40%	% change TotSw	2 3 4 5	0.0245 0.0247 0.0248 0.0250 0.0251									
					7 8 2 3	0.0251 0.0253 0.0255 0.0245 0.0247									
					4 5 6 7	0.0248 0.0250 0.0251 0.0253		data source	•						
				d	unadi rev	0.0255 slc rev	ts unadi rev	period							

5 period ts unadj rev 4 \$5,461,496 82/4 83/4 8 \$6,562,000 83/4 84/4 9 \$7,02,456 84/4 85/4 85/2 87/2 9 \$8,637,220 87/3 88/3 1 \$8,482,946 88/2 89/2 6 \$8,609,845 89/4 90/4 8 \$9,054,015 90/4 91/4

Clunadj rev slc rev \$10,172,842 \$10,878,568 \$2,484,658 \$10,213,735 \$3,648,049 \$10,012,595 \$4,563,679 \$9,807,040 \$5,703,289 \$9,568,617 \$5,926,881 \$9,985,161 \$6,026,676 \$9,481,498 \$6,230,468 \$\$

A 1 2 3 4		B (1+Y24)/(1+AC24)-1 QAVG(S42S48) +Q48/P48	C based on unadj. CL minutes based on unadj. rev	D	E ALT G retrieves the data fro	P 7 19 32 50 63.5	1	R 8 PERIOD TS RATE/MOU REGRESSION	W 19.02828287 19.11356205 19.10620345 19.31459223 19.44856070	X 7 19 32 50 63.5	Y 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Z 8 PERIOD CL MOU REGRESSION	AA 18.51567708 18.54569309 18.56664941 18.61659458 - 18.64658065	AB 7 19 32 50 63.5	AC 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	AD 8 PERIOD LINES REGRESSION
6 IN	DIVX	4.28%	•		ALT Z performs the eight-per		1		19.53857247 19.60447847	74 86	1		18 69192902 18 71591324	74 86 98	1	
8 9 10	Per Line X =				for 4 Xs based on fitted values	s from regressions			19.67145657	98			18.74011052			
11 12 13 14 15	Compromise X =	2 98%	% change CCL	% change TS	#ks = M32,M39,Q32) % change TotSw	Regression Output	:	0.0763 : 0.0464 i	P Constant Std Err of Y Est R Squared No. of Observatio	Regression Or	ири.	0.04034938	Constant Std Err of Y Est	egression Outp ns	AUI.	0 0.00633965 0.99494241 8
16	Per Line	(1+(((P48+0)/P48)*((B2	-(P48*(B16-1)+Q48*(B1	+B2-C10	(((P48-Q48)/(P48+R48))	C16)+((R48/(P4	48+R48))*	6 (Degrees of Freed	lom		6	Degrees of Freed	om		6
17 18 19 UN 20	WITARYX						0.0005 0.0009		X Coefficient(s) Sld Err of Coef.		0.007565688363 0.000469576808		X Coefficient(s) SId Err of Coef.		025347664267 000737793806	18.4944456894 0.00455122583
21 22 23	Per Line X = Compromise X =		weighted average of individual back-solve for comp. X ber (formula cell = E28)				0.024367175 0.025454421 0.58%				178525235.635 355387096.6166 Y18+1)^(12)-1				0582588.34637 138012221.28 18+1)^(12)-1	
24 25 26 27			% change CCL	% change TS	% change TotSw	2 3	0.0245 0.0247			11	110:17 (12) 1			0.770	, (,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	Compromise	•	{B2-B23-{(B1/2)*(1-B3)	+B2-B23	<u>((+P48-Q48)/(P48-Q48+</u>	4 5 6 7 8 2 3 4 5 6	0.0248 0.0250 0.0251 0.0253 0.0255 0.0245 0.0247 0.0248 0.0250 0.0251		data source							
39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47						8 ci unadi rev sic \$10,172,842 \$10,878,588 \$10,213,735 \$10,012,595 \$9,807,040 \$9,568,617 \$9,365,161	0.0255 (ev \$1,296,104 \$2,484,658 \$3,446,949 \$4,563,679 \$5,703,289 \$5,926,881 \$6,062,676 6230468	\$8,231,744 \$8,637,220 \$8,492,946		7 19 32 50 63.5 74 86	12 13 18 13.5 10.5 12					

SCHIPLEX PARTE



United States Telephone Association

1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20005-2136 (202) 326-7300 (202) 326-7333 FAX

February 24, 1995

Mr. William F. Caton Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554



Mermott

RE: Ex Parte Notice CC Docket No. 94-1

Dear Mr. Caton:

The attachment to this letter explains how Total Factor Productivity would be calculated each year for purposes of USTA's moving average productivity offset.

As the attachment demonstrates, developing the TFP is a simple eight step process. Ninety percent of the data inputs are available from public sources filed with the FCC.

The original and a copy of this ex parte notice are being filed in the Office of the Secretary. Please include it in the public record of this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary McDermott Vice President -

Legal & Regulatory Affairs

UNITED STATES TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION TOTAL FACTOR PRODUCTIVITY (TFP) INSTRUCTIONS MANUAL

As displayed in the attachments, developing a TFP study is a simple eight step process. Almost all of the data inputs (90%) required for the study are available from public sources filed with the FCC. In addition to the inputs, an updated Christensen TFP study, covering the period 1984-1993, is also on file with the Commission. USTA filed this study as an Ex Parte exhibit on January 18, 1995 in CC Docket 94-1. The filing included paper and diskette copies of the study. The diskette copy is in a standard Lotus 1-2-3 (version 3) format which facilitates ongoing revisions to the TFP analysis.

The Christensen TFP study, commissioned by USTA, reflects data for the seven regional Bell Operating companies, GTE and Southern New England Telephone. Total Factor Productivity is the ratio of total output to total input, where total output includes all services provided by the Local Exchange Carriers and total input includes the capital, labor and materials used to provide those services.

Attached is a two part TFP Instructions Manual which details the steps necessary to update the Christensen TFP study. Attachment A list the major steps required to update the TFP in general. It also provides Lotus cell references for all inputs required to update the analysis for 1994 data. Attachment B provides detailed step-by-step instructions on how the LECs developed their Telephone Plant Indexes (TPIs). These TPIs were developed as part of the first step in the TFP process.

UPDATING TFP - STEPS IN THE PROCESS

- Step 1 Update "Capital Input Analysis" Worksheet:
 - Populate Current Dollar Investment input section (Lotus cells A:L8..A:L13) with ARMIS 43-02 additions to plant in service.
 - Populate Asset Prices input section (Lotus cells A:L20..A:L25) with updated TPI data for current year (see additional writeup on TPIs).
 - Develop LEC cost of capital and input at Lotus cell A:L125. LECs used Moody's Composite Public Utility Bond Yield as a proxy for their cost of capital.
 - LEC depreciation rates (Lotus cells A:AD5..A:AD7) based on Dale Jorgensen Study of Economic Depreciation rates. These rates will help develop LEC capital stock values.
 - 1984 Gross Stock, Economic Stock/Gross Stock Adjustment Factor and Capital/Expense Shift inputs all reflect historical data that are not updated for ongoing TFP analyses.
- Step 2 Update "MRS Expense Input" Worksheet (Lotus cell G17) for total current year operating expenses (excluding compensation expense and depreciation). Also, update GDPPI inputs (Lotus cell Q17) to develop deflated (real) operating expenses for the current year. The 1984 through 1987 Nonregulated Expense and Capital/Expense Shift Adjustments reflect historical data that are not updated for on-going TFP analyses.
- Step 3 Update "Labor Input" worksheet for current year salaries & wages, benefits, labor hours and average number of employees for both management and nonmanagement labor.
 - Management data are located at Lotus cells L5..L9
 - Nonmanagement data are located at Lotus cells L10..L14
- Step 4 Update Operating Revenues worksheet for current year booked (Lotus cells A:K5..A:K15) and billed (Lotus cells A:K22..A:K24) revenues. The 1984 Special Access and 1984 through 1987 Nonregulated Adjustments reflect historical data that are not updated for on-going TFP analyses.
- Step 5 Update "Special Access Price Index" (Lotus cell F31) for current year API as reported on LECs' Annual Price Cap TRPs.
- Step 6 Update "Rate Changes for Intrastate Price Indexes" worksheet:
 - Booked (ARMIS 43-04) Revenues are located at Lotus cells C17 (Local), C33 (Toll) and C50 (Intrastate Access).

- Credit Amounts are located at Lotus cells B17 (Local), B33 (Toll) and B50 (Intrastate Access).
- Annualized Revenue Changes are located at Lotus cells D17 (Local), D33 (Toll) and D50 (Intrastate Access).
- Effective Revenue Changes are located at Lotus cells E17 (Local), E33 (Toll) E50 and (Intrastate Access).

Step 7 Update "Common Line & Traffic Sensitive" worksheet:

- MOUs are located at Lotus cells A:B15 (CL) and A:C15 (Traffic Sensitive).
- Revenues are located at Lotus cells A:E15 (CL) and A:F15 (Traffic Sensitive).

Step 8 Update "Access Lines" worksheet for end of year Switched Access Lines in Service

- RBOC data is located at Lotus cell C16
- GTE data is located at Lotus cell D16
- SNET data is located at Lotus cell E16

Following are sources for inputs required to update ongoing TFP analyses. In most cases, inputs can be derived from ARMIS reports (43-01, 43-02, 43-04 and 43-08) filed with the FCC. Other inputs (e.g. LEC cost of capital, GDPPI) are readily available as well, as they are reported on publicly available documents. Few inputs (e.g. disaggregation of composite labor data) require special studies by the LECs; however, the underlying data for these special studies reflect ARMIS data..

TFP INPUTS - SOURCES OF HISTORICAL DATA

Worksheet	<u>Item</u>	Source					
* Capital Input Analysis	Current Dollar Investment	Reflect additions to plant in service as reported on Form M, Table 12A, Col d and ARMIS 43-02, Table B-1- 3 (Balance Sheet Accts), Col (ac)					
	Asset Prices	LEC TPI Analyses. See additional writeup on TPIs.					
	Cost of Capital	Moody's Composite Public Utility Bond Yield					
	Depreciation Rates	Dale Jorgensen Study of Economic Depreciation Rates					
	1984 Gross Stock	Reflects the cost of reproducing gross plant for each LEC. Based on analysis of LECs' records.					
	Econo Stock/Gross Stock Adjust Factor	Reflects the decline in economic value of gross stock of various vintages. Reflects analysis of Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) of the Telecommunications Industry's 1984 gross and economic capital stock					
	1984 - 1987 Cap/ Exps Shift	Reflects the shift in costs from capital accounts to expenses accounts resulting from the FCC's change in accounting rules from Part 31 to Part 32. Analysis of 1988 TRP, Forms COS-2(P)31 and COS-2(P)32.					
* MRS Expense Inputs	Composite Expenses	Reflect total company operating expenses (excluding salaries, wages, benefits and depreciation) as reported on:					
		1984 - 1987 Form M reports, (Table 35, Col (b), Row 68- Row 19-compensation expense + Table 36A, Col (f), Row 26					

Worksheet	<u>Item</u>	Page A4 Source				
* MRS Expense Inputs	Composite Expenses	1988 - 1993 ARMIS 43-02 reports, Table I-1 (Income Statement Accounts), Cols (ab)-(ac)-(ad), Rows 720-6561				
	1984-1987 Nonreg Exp Adjst	Analysis of company records; separately identifies nonregulated expenses reflected in Total Company Form M costs.				
	Cap/Exps Shift (1984-1987)	Analysis of 1988 TRP, Forms COS-2(P)31 and COS-2(P)32.				
	GDPPI	Used to deflate MRS expenses to reflect MRS quantities (real expenses). Reflects U.S. Government statistics, analysis of BEA				
* Composite Labor Data	Management and Nonmanagement costs and labor hours distributions were determined based on analysis of LECs' records. Total labor costs reflect expensed amounts reported on Form M and ARMIS 43-02 reports.					
	Labor Hours	Analysis of LEC records				
	Average # of Employees	Analysis of LECs records				
	1984 - 1987 Sal & Wages	Analysis of Form M, Table 35, Row 68, Col (b)				
	1984 - 1987 Benefits	Analysis of Form M, Table 35, Row 68, Col (b)				
	1988 - 1993 Sal & Wages	Armis 43-02, Table I-1 (Income Statement Accounts), Row 720, Col (ac)				
	1988 - 1993 Benefits	ARMIS 43-02, Table I-1 (Income Statement Accounts), Row 720, Col (ad)				

		Page A5
Worksheet	<u>Item</u>	Source
* Output Indexes (Operating Revenues)	Booked Revenues	1984 through 1987 - Form M, Table 34:
	Local EU IS Access Switched IS Access Special IS Access Intrastate Access Total Toll Total Misc Total Uncoll Nonreg Adjst	Row 13, Col (b) Row 15, Col (d) Row 16, Col (d) Row 17, Col (d) Row 19, Col (b) Row 31, Col (b) Row 40, Col (b) Row 41, Col (b) Analysis of company records; separately identifies nonregulated revenues in account 5280 reflected in Total Company Form M revenues.
	1984 Special Access Adjst	Analysis of 1985 Ad Hoc Data Reporting Task Group Submissions. Reflects misclassified Special Access Revenues.
	Booked Revenues	1988 - 1993 Jurisdictional revenues, ARMIS 43-04 Table I:
	EU IS Access Switched IS Access Special IS Access Intrastate Access	Row 4010 and EU portion of Row 4012, Col (d) Row 4011, Col (d) Row 4012, Col (d) Row 4013, Col (d)
	Booked Revenues	1988 - 1993 Total company revenues, ARMIS 43-02 Table I (Income Statement Accounts):
	Local Total Toll Total Misc Total Uncoll	Row 520, Col (b) Row 525, Col (b) Row 5200, Col (b) Row 5300, Col (b)

Billed Revenues

Analysis of companies' records

P	2	o,	A.	6

		Page A6				
Worksheet	<u>Item</u>	Source				
* Special Access Price Index	i.	Reflects the relative change in Special Access prices:				
	1988 - 1992 indexes	Reflect input data which supported Special Access Portion of Frenthrup/Uretsky TFP analysis done by NERA.				
	1984 - 1987 indexes	Reflect the average 1988 - 1992 index.				
	1993 index	Reflects Special Access API as reported on LECs annual price cap TRP filings.				
* Rate Changes for Intra- state Price Indexes	Booked Revenues	1984 - 1987 Form M, Table 34, analysis of Col (b):				
	Local	Row 13				
	Intrastate Access	Row 19				
	Total Toll	Row 31				
	10121011	10W 31				
	Booked Revenues	1988 - 1993 ARMIS 43-04 Table I:				
	Local	Row 4005, Col (c)				
	Intrastate Access	Row 4013, Col (c)				
	Total Toll	Row 4024, Col (c)				
	Revenue Changes & Credits	Reflect impact of state utility commissions' orders in state rate case proceedings.				
* CL & TS MOU and Revs	Minute of Use	Reflect derived MOUs as reported on:				
		1984 - 1987 Annual TRP,				
		Table DMD3:				
	2 * * *	D 120 G I A				
	Common Line	Row 130, Col A				
	Traffic Sensitive	Row 130, Col B				
		1988 - 1993 ARMIS 43-01,				
		Table II, Cols (b) through (d)				
		sum of four quarterly reports:				
	Common Line	Rows 2010 through 2040				
	Traffic Sensitive	Rows 2050 + 2060				

Worksheet	<u>Item</u>	Source
* CL & TS MOU and Revs	Revenues	Reflect booked revenues as reported on: 1984 - 1987 Annual TRP, Table COS 1H:
	Common Line Traffic Sensitive	Row 175, Col K Row 175, Col P 1988 - 1993 ARMIS 43-01, Table I:
	Common Line Traffic Sensitive	Row 1020, Col (m) Row 1020, Col (r)
* Switched Access Lines	Demand Data	1984 - 1990, DMD2, Row 170
		1991 - 1993, ARMIS 43-08, Row 0910, Col (cj)

TELEPHONE PLANT INDEXES (TPIs)

DEFINITION:

Telephone Plant Indexes are measures of the relative changes in the cost of constructing telephone plant-in-service (including materials and labor components), with respect to the embedded base of telephone plant. All major elements of cost are included in constructing the TPI. They are capital purchases (materials), contracted labor and engineering, company labor and company engineering. Using an index year of 1984, the TPI plant accounts are weighted to a composite index using the dollar value of current year booked costs.

The TPI is a variable weight price index. The calculations are based on a generally accepted adaptation of the Divisia Index which takes the growth rates of individual prices (the various telephone plant accounts) between successive periods and weights each by its proportion of total expenditure in the latest period. Its advantage is that, as a variable weight type price index, improvements made in technology or technology shifts are automatically reflected by the dollars reported in each account. For example, if new equipment decreases the amount of time it takes for an installer to complete his job, this will be reflected in the dollars for associate labor. As network composition shifts from copper to fiber, efficiencies gained from the new technology in added capacity will be reflected in plant subaccounts with fiber by a materials weight inversely related to the increased capacity.

DEVELOPMENT OF TPIs:

The TPI is developed using company data sources such as: subsidiary ledgers that support the ARMIS 43-02 and Form M reports and financial systems. The TPI for each sub-account is calculated separately, then aggregated to form the overall TPI. Within each subaccount, the growth rates of each component is calculated separately, and then weighted together each year. These components are materials, company labor costs and contract labor costs. The components are aggregated for a given subaccount based on the portion of actual capital dollars in that subaccount devoted to each component in a given year.

Actual data are used to calculate the current year growth rate for each component of each subaccount. The weights used to aggregate the materials and labor costs are updated periodically. The weights used to aggregate subaccounts are determined each year based on booked costs, as reflected in company subsidiary ledgers. For example, 1993 dollars were used for computation of the 1993 TPIs which became available in the third quarter of 1994.